

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20-25 are pending in the application.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahoney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,841).

The claims are amended, thus the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

No new matter has been added.

The Office Action Response to Arguments provides the claim language “administrator of the data” could be a user in Mahoney. The Office Action relies upon Mahoney’s discussion of a user specifying which document image attributes and features are most relevant to their (the user’s) browsing or searching tasks, and the system transmitting the layout objects having the user specified features or attributes at a first or high resolution (Abstract, column 31, lines 1-40).

Thus, Mahoney discusses that document images are transmitted at a high resolution depending upon a user specification of attributes and features. The claims are amended to recite “a control information recording unit recording control information related to data restricted by an administratora provider of the data from being provided depending on said request source.” For example, the specification page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 23 and page 9, lines 16-22 support the claims. Although a user of Mahoney receives document images and the user identifies the attributes and features of a document image, a user of Mahoney does not provide the data, namely the language of the claims provide “data restricted by an administratora provider of the data.” A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Mahoney cannot be established, because Mahoney fails to disclose expressly or inherently the claimed “a control information recording unit recording ***control information related to data restricted by an administratora provider of the data*** from being provided depending on said request source; an edit unit creating the response data corresponding to the request data in accordance with the control information by preventing ***an area restricted by the administratora provider of the data*** from being provided to said request source; and a transmitting unit providing the response

data,” in which “a provider of the data” sets restrictions on response data depending on the request source.

In other words, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established, because Mahoney’s user does not expressly disclose the claimed “a provider of the data” setting restriction on the data. Further, there is no evidence that Mahoney would inherently or necessarily require the user of the data to also be a “a provider of the data,” so Mahoney fails to disclose expressly or inherently creating the response data corresponding to the request data from a request source based upon “control information related to data restricted by ~~an administrator~~ a provider of the data,” because Mahoney discusses that document images are previously segmented into layout objects based upon a user specification rather than by “a provider of the data.” Mahoney differs from the claimed “an edit unit creating the response data corresponding to the request data in accordance with the control information by ***preventing an area restricted by the administrator*** a provider of the data from being provided to said request source.”

For example, the present application FIGs. 3-4 illustrate the user, namely “a provider of the data” inputting an IP address of a requesting client, a target file and coordinates of the specified area, as hiding information. When the client having the input IP address requests data, the edit unit uses the corresponding hiding information of the client to create response data based upon the hiding information. A benefit of the claimed embodiment is that data restricted by “a provider of the data” is prevented from being transmitted to the request source (user). Mahoney does not discuss expressly or inherently this feature, because Mahoney discusses that document images are transmitted at a high resolution depending on a user specification rather than the claimed “a provider of the data,” namely “preventing an area restricted by ~~the administrator~~ a provider of the data from being provided to said request source” according to “control information related to data restricted by ~~an administrator~~ a provider of the data from being provided depending on said request source.”

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-25 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ August 18, 2008 \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Mehdi D. Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501